

May 7, 1979

LB 348

or a misdemeanor section in and that does just the opposite of what we want it to do because it would apply to anybody who parks their cars illegally. So, for that reason we have to take that out. It was a mistake that we made. The other thing is that we changed from car to motor vehicles, which is sort of a technical amendment, and lastly we tighten down just exactly what damages is. Senator Beutler came to me with some amendments which would make it more clear what damages would be. For that reason I move that we return the bill to add these amendments.

PRESIDENT: Any discussion on the Newell motion to return? Seeing none, the motion before the House is the return of LB 348 for a specific amendment. All those in favor vote aye, those opposed vote nay. Record the vote.

CLERK: 28 ayes, no nays on the motion to return Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries, LB 348 is returned. Chair recognizes Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Just briefly on the amendment, Senator George came to me and asked whether this "we" was, I will take the blame for the misdemeanor. It was a mistake of mine. I sort of thought in...anyways that was my mistake. The others are not. The car to motor vehicles is sort of a technical thing. I move the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would like to raise a point. Senator DeCamp stated earlier that LB 42 was in need of an A bill. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee tells me that in his opinion LB 42 does not need an A bill. Therefore I would ask that the bill be taken up this morning and considered this morning.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cullan, let's wait till we get off of this particular motion, and then we will go back to that. We are speaking now to LB 348. Senator Duis, do you want to speak to 348?

SENATOR DUIS: Mr. President, only a question of....if we wouldn't pass 348, may I speak to Senator Newell?

PRESIDENT: Senator Newell, will you respond?

SENATOR DUIS: It would then be a requirement of the city to pass an ordinance, wouldn't it?